C2175-1A

THE CHRONICLE
of Higher Education

December 18, 1985 • $1.75
Volume XXXI, Number 16

News Summary

HOLIDAY NOTICE

[illegible] issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education will be published on January 8, [illegible] publication schedule.

A law enacted last week to [illegible] cuts the federal budget by 1991 has [illegible] representatives of higher education [illegible] Story on Page 1.

The use of field notes in a [illegible] many sources of information for [illegible] researchers. Story on Page 7.

Higher-education leaders in the [illegible] alarm on the need to [illegible] teachers' academic standards and [illegible] increased access for minority groups. Story on Page 9.

Special postal rates that colleges and universities receive many of their mailings will increase sharply on January 1. Story on Page 9.

Two professors at Northwestern University have been [illegible] and the attack. The Secretary of Academic [illegible] Story on Page 19.

Winter break can be [illegible] health time of the year [illegible] students who have to stay [illegible] Story on Page 31.

Officials at Texas A&M University [illegible] disclosed to respond to charges that Southwest Football players had been paid hundreds of dollars by boosters. Story on Page 35.

Demonstrators gathered in Oslo to protest the selection of Yevgeny I. Chazov as one of the winners of the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize. Story on Page 37.

The Polish government defended its crackdown on university administrators. Story on Page 39.

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

Athletics	35-36
Bulletin Board	48-87
Calendar of Events	44-47
Deadlines	47
Deaths	43
Gazette	43
Government & Politics	9-17
Grants	43-44
International News	37-40
Letters & Opinion	41-42
Personal & Professional	19-30
Philanthropy	18
Scholarship	5-8
Students	31-34

New Carnegie Data Show Faculty Members Uneasy About the State of Academe and Their Own Careers

Professors think academic standards are too low, students are too weak, and pay is inadequate

By ROBERT L. JACOBSON

[illegible] any college person writing [illegible] on academe, [illegible] these days, about [illegible] of all kinds and universities, faculty members would [illegible] the adage. Don't do it. They're not a good bet.

The proportion of faculty members who feel that way—nearly [illegible] 43 per cent at all types of institutions, and small, public and private [illegible] cent and 50th year—according to [illegible] newly published faculty [illegible] Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The reasons for such [illegible] vary greatly. The data suggest, [illegible] pervasive, uneasiness among faculty members over the state of academe in an educational sense and over their own chief targets in both personal and professional terms.

By all signs, the [illegible] faculty view is that academic standards and [illegible] low, students are too weak, the [illegible] intelligent environment is [illegible] best, and faculty compensation and working conditions are inadequate.

In addition, many faculty members report an erosion of job security, [illegible] of prospects for professional advancement, and considerable personal strain because of their work. Nearly one-fourth also agree, at least to some degree, that the caliber of undergraduate education provided by their own insti-

Selected findings from the Carnegie Foundation survey of faculty members appear in tables beginning on Page 25.

[illegible] tutions has declined in the past few years.

Some evidence of widespread faculty dissatisfaction in higher education has been reported in recent months by Ernest L. Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation, and others who have made separate studies of the academic profession. But the extent of the malaise has now been brought to light in more detail by statistics from the copyrighted Carnegie survey, which covered 5,000 faculty members at a representative sample of 330 institutions in the spring of 1984.

A comparison of the findings with data from a similar survey of 25,000 faculty members that was conducted in 1975 by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education shows that faculty dissatisfaction generally has increased.

The proportion calling standards for undergraduate education too low, for example, has gone from about 52 per cent in the earlier survey to about 63 per cent. Those rating the academic ability of undergraduates at their institutions fair or poor is up from about 48 per cent in the earlier survey to about 59 per cent.

Faculty members' negative evaluations of their salaries and working conditions also have become more prevalent. For those who participated in the

Continued on Page 24, Column 1

Supreme Court Curbs Judges' Right to Overturn Academic Decisions

By STACY E. PALMER

[illegible]

The Supreme Court last week issued a ruling that sharply limited the right of judges to overturn academic decisions made by faculty members.

Because it upheld the right of faculty members to use their professional discretion when making decisions about a student's academic career, the ruling was interpreted as a major victory for higher education.

In a case involving a medical student who was dismissed in 1981 from the University of Michigan, the Court ruled unanimously that students should not ask judges to reverse academic decisions that have been made by faculty members—unless they can argue they have been discriminated against or have been treated arbitrarily.

The student, Scott E. Ewing, was dismissed after he failed a major test that all students at the medical school are required to pass. He asked the Court to require the university to let him retake the test, noting that the school had allowed the 39 other students who failed the test to take it again. He said the school's refusal to allow him to do so had violated his constitutional right to due process of the law.

College officials denied they had treated

Continued on Page 33, Column 3

Reagan Administration May Seek 50 to 100 New Research Centers

By KIM McDONALD

[illegible] WASHINGTON

The success of six new federally supported, university-based research centers that combine the talents of industrial and academic researchers from different disciplines has prompted White House science officials to consider adding 50 to 100 more. The total federal support for them could reach $500-million a year.

Key Administration officials have been so pleased with the six multidisciplinary engineering-research centers created by the National Science Foundation last spring that they would like to see the concept expanded by other agencies.

Some science leaders have expressed concern, however, that such centers could reduce support for projects generated by

Continued on Page 7, Column 2

How U.S. Aid May Change

House-passed legislation extending major college-aid programs differs markedly from present law and from a bill approved last week by a Senate subcommittee. See table beginning on Page 12 and story on Page 15.

'Spirit of Geneva' Is Seen Fostering Scholar Exchanges

By MALCOLM G. SCULLY

Prospects for expanded communication between American and Soviet scholars appear to have improved significantly since the Geneva summit, according to representatives of the American Council of Learned Societies who signed a new five-year exchange agreement in Moscow this month.

"We found the Soviets more readily outgoing than in the past," said Robert M. Lumiansky, president of the ACLS and one of the signers of the agreement. "I think they see the events at the summit as forming a framework for much more relaxed and expanded give and take between the two countries."

'Word Has Gone Out in Moscow'

Allen H. Kassof, executive director of the International Research and Exchanges Board, a New York agency that administers the scholarly exchanges, added, "There is no question that the word has gone out in Moscow that there is now to be a positive relationship in dealing with the United States. This has happened very quickly after the summit."

The agreement negotiated between the ACLS and the Soviet Academy of Sciences is not technically part of the cultural-exchange accord approved by President

Continued on Page 40, Column 1

Faculty Members Uneasy, New Data Show

Ernest L. Boyer: Teaching in college should provide more opportunities for professional satisfaction and reward.

Worrisome, Boyer Says

Views Vary on Core Curriculum

Slight Increase in Conservatism

INSTRUCTIONAL MICROCOMPUTING SEMINARS

Sponsored by

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and IBM Academic Information Systems

These seminars for academic leaders responsible for integrating personal computing into the curriculum will explore:

- Strategies for effectively implementing a microcomputer program
- Supporting creative faculty involvement
- Evaluation, development and effective use of instructional software

DATES:

January 29–31, 1986
February 24–26, 1986
March 26–28, 1986
April 16–18, 1986

Call (919) 962-0101 for information and brochure.

THE COOLIDGE RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM

at Episcopal Divinity School • Cambridge, Massachusetts
June 8 through July 4, 1986
invites applications to be one of twenty-five Jewish and Christian participants from intellectuals in or out of the academy,

to work on an individual project at the intersection of intellectual and religious concerns grounded in a religious tradition(s), and to share in dialogue and worship together.

The Colloquium provides participants with room, board, access to library and other facilities and to three resource theologians—Jewish, Catholic, Protestant—who will foster regular religious life according to their own traditions, present lectures and dialogues for the whole group, and be available to individual participants for consultation tutorials (the Colloquium regrets that it cannot pay travel). The resource theologians are: Rabbi Richard Levy, poet, editor, and director of the Los Angeles Hillel Council; Sister Mary Luke Tobin, S.L., former superior of the Convent of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross, friend and advisor of Thomas Merton, now residing in Denver, Colorado; and Dr. Gene Klaaren, department of religion, Wesleyan College, especially interested in religious reflection on creation.

Applicants are to be persons interested in sharing a common life as the context for their individual research. Applications are to be letters, which present: (1) a succinct account of education, employment, and accomplishments relevant to either the Colloquium in general or the proposal in particular; (2) a description of the proposal focused on a problem present at a meeting place between religious and disciplinary or interdisciplinary concerns; and (3) the names, titles, institutional addresses and telephones of two references. **Applications go to Elizabeth B. & R. Melvin Keiser, Coolidge Research Colloquium, 815 Dalley Madison Road, Greensboro, NC 27410 (919-292-5616) by the deadline February 1, 1986.** Participants will be notified by March 1. When participants are notified of acceptance, they are to reserve their position by paying a $100 deposit fee, to be refunded at the end of the Colloquium.

The Coolidge Research Colloquium is a program of Associates for Religion and Intellectual Life (ARIL), whose purpose is to help Jews and Christians explore the relation of their religious commitment to their intellectual work. Other ARIL programs are: *Religion & Intellectual Life* (a sunstantial quarterly journal), the *Annual Associates Consultation* (a four-day members' conference), and local regional conferences. Annual membership dues are $25.00. Associates of Religion and Intellectual Life, College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, New York 10801

FACT-FILE

Who Faculty Members Are, and What They Think

A profile of the professoriate, based on results of a 1984 Carnegie Foundation survey

Characteristics

Age as of Dec. 31, 1984
19 or younger
20-24
25-29
30-34
35-39
40-44
45-49
50-54
55-59
60 or older

Sex
Male
Female

Race or ethnic group
White
Black
American Indian
Mexican-American
Puerto Rican
Oriental or Asian-American
Other

Religion in which raised
Protestant
Jewish
Catholic
Other
None

Present religion
Protestant
Jewish
Catholic
Other
None

Depth of religious conviction
Moderate to strong
Leaning toward none
Opposed to religion

Marital status
Married
Separated or divorced
Widowed
Never married

Dependent children
Under 6 years old
None
One
Two or more
6 years old and over
None
One
Two or more

Present academic rank
Professor 18.1%
Associate professor 24.5%
Assistant professor 29.6%
Instructor 12.7%
Lecturer 3.4%
No designated rank 4.1%
Other 1.3%

Type of appointment
Regular with tenure 69.5%
Regular without tenure 25.6%
Acting 1.9%
Visiting 3.0%

Status if not tenured:
Tenure track 58.8%
Job security under collective agreement 7.8%
Neither 41.4%

Full-time gross salary in 1983-84
Less than $20,000 14.8%
$20,000-$21,999 7.4%
$22,000-$24,999 12.7%
$25,000-$27,999 12.1%
$28,000-$30,999 12.2%
$31,000-$33,999 10.8%
$34,000-$36,999 9.1%
$37,000-$39,999 5.6%
$40,000 or more 14.8%

Salary basis
9-10 months 15.0%
11-12 months 85.0%

Spouse's income in 1983
None 15.3%
Less than $10,000 9.7%
$10,000-$14,999 7.9%
$15,000-$19,999 7.0%
$20,000-$24,999 7.1%
$25,000-$29,999 7.1%
$30,000-$34,999 6.1%
$35,000-$39,999 5.1%
$40,000 or more 14.7%

Extra annual earnings in recent years (as per cent of salary)
0% 19.2%
Less than 10% 22.2%
10%-19% 22.4%
20%-29% 10.9%
30%-39% 4.3%
40%-49% 1.6%
50% or more 6.4%

A footnote appears on Page 28

Sources of supplementary income
None 44.1%
Nonacademic employment 11.0%
Extra-time teaching or research 11.0%
Consulting 5.1%
Performing, other professional 4.2%
Writing 14.2%

Have been a consultant during past two years for
State or local government 38.4%
Federal government 34.5%
Private business or industry 29.0%
Own institution 19.3%
Foreign government 18.0%
University-based research project 15.4%
Other 14.1%

Completed highest degree before children were born

Nature of teaching responsibilities
Undergraduate only
Graduate only
Both undergraduate and graduate
Other

Number of students in courses
None
1-9
10-19
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
70-79
80 or more

Average hours per week devoted to responsibilities
Undergraduate instruction
0-2 5.1%
3-5 20.1%
6-8 30.4%
9-11 20.8%
12 or more 23.6%
Graduate instruction
0-2 33.8%
3-5 40.5%
6-8 16.5%
9-11 5.4%
12 or more 3.8%
Scheduled office hours
0-2 21.9%
3-5 41.7%
6-8 26.5%
9 or more 9.9%
Administration, committee work
0-2 16.2%
3-5 34.0%
6 or more 49.7%
Consulting
0-2 73.5%
3-5 17.0%
6 or more 9.4%
Outside professional practice
0-2 76.8%
3-5 10.0%
6 or more 13.2%
Preparation for teaching
0-2 12.3%
3-5 34.0%
6 or more 53.7%
Research
0-2 39.0%
3-5 20.6%
6 or more 40.4%
Advising students (on matters unrelated to specific course)
0-2 53.0%
3-5 34.8%
6 or more 12.1%

Number of articles published in academic, professional journals
None 50.1%
1 10.4%
2 8.2%
3-5 14.1%
6-10 9.1%
11 or more 8.1%

Number of books or monographs published or edited
None 69.2%
1 15.4%
2 7.4%
3 or more 8.0%

Number of professional writings published or accepted for publication in last two years
None 36.6%
1 24.0%
2 13.6%
3-5 16.2%
6-10 5.2%
11 or more 4.3%

Currently doing research expected to lead to publication 60.8%

Have a working association with a research institute or center at own institution 27.1%

Sources of research support in past year:
Institution, department 51.1%
Federal government 25.6%
State or local government 12.0%
Private foundation 12.6%
Private industry 12.8%
Other 6.5%

People with whom working on research:
Graduate research assistants 36.3%
Undergraduate helpers, trainees 9.0%
Full-time professional level research personnel 19.2%

Membership in organizations
American Association of University Professors 31.5%
American Federation of Teachers 23.1%
American Association of University Women 11.8%
Phi Beta Kappa 11.8%
Other association limited to college teachers 41.8%
Other association not confined to college teachers 17.8%
Association limited to teachers at own institution (other than academic senate or council) 19.6%

Have had contact with schoolteachers during past year 50.7%

Now working for higher degree 9.9%

Education background
Degrees now working for:
Less than Bachelor's 1.0%
Bachelor's 2.9%
First professional: law 0.4%
First professional: medicine 0.3%
Other first professional 1.1%
Master's 13.8%
Doctor of Arts or equivalent (no dissertation) 2.0%
Ph.D. 47.0%
Ed.D. 12.2%
Other doctorate 2.2%
None 13.7%
Degrees now held:
Less than Bachelor's 8.6%
Bachelor's 32.0%
First professional: law 1.6%
First professional: medicine 2.9%
Master's 24.6%
Doctor of Arts or equivalent (no dissertation) 9.8%
Ph.D. 48.8%
Ed.D. 5.2%
Other doctorate 1.5%
None 0.4%

Have been a student at a community or junior college 20.6%

Possibilities for different job in the coming fall
Academic job:
Negotiating, or found and accepted one 6.8%
Actively looking for one 10.8%
Would seriously consider one if offered 32.1%
Nonacademic job:
Negotiating, or found and accepted one 3.6%
Actively looking for one 4.2%
Would seriously consider one if offered 47.8%

Number of members in department (instructor or above)
10 or fewer 22.0%
11-20 21.1%
21-30 14.1%
31 or more 42.8%

Change in size of department in past three years
Somewhat or much larger 28.2%
About the same 51.4%
Smaller 20.5%

Length of chairman's appointment
Fixed term (three years or less), normally not renewed 1.5%
Fixed term, with possibility or likelihood of renewal 32.6%
Long or indefinite appointment 44.5%

Role of regular department faculty, including nontenured members, in nonpersonnel decisions:
Faculty vote 54.6%
No faculty vote 19.0%
If varies 26.3%

National professional meetings attended during past year:
None 32.6%
One 29.3%
Two 22.1%
Three 8.8%
Four or more 7.3%

Participate usually or sometimes in campus meetings:
Departmental faculty 92.3%
Faculty senate or equivalent 35.4%
Campus-wide faculty committee 53.0%
Administrative advisory committee 37.2%

Teaching load
Full load 67.6%
More than half but less than full 12.9%
Half load 8.3%
Less than half load 11.3%

Full-time or part-time status
Full time 92.2%
Part time but more than half time 2.2%
Half time 1.6%
Less than half time 4.0%

Since obtaining highest degree employed for at least six years in:
University teaching 53.4%
Four-year college teaching 26.9%
Junior college or community college teaching 22.4%
Non-faculty college research 1.8%
Postdoctoral fellowship, traineeship 0.7%
Full-time college administration 5.5%
Elementary or secondary school 8.4%
Research and development outside educational institution 4.5%
Administrative post outside educational institutions 3.0%
Other professional position 13.2%
Armed forces 1.6%
Other position 0.7%

Spouse's occupations
College or university teaching, research, administration 13.9%
Schoolteaching, administration 13.3%
Other professional job 17.6%
Owner, large business 0.3%

Continued on Following Page

Disciplinary Backgrounds, Interests of College Teachers

	Department	Primary field of interest	Undergraduate majored in	Subject of highest degree
Biological sciences				
Biochemistry	1.7%	1.6%	1.8%	1.8%
Botany	1.1%	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%
Microbiology	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%
Zoology	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%
Anatomy	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
Physiology	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
Pharmacology	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Molecular biology	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
General, other biological sciences	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
Education				
Teaching of specific subjects	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%
Administration, supervision	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Counseling, personnel work	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Special education	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
General, other education	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Engineering				
Aeronautical, astronautical	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
Chemical	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
Civil	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
Electrical	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Mechanical	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
General, other engineering	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%	1.0%
Fine Arts				
Art	2.2%	2.2%	2.4%	1.8%
Dramatics and speech	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%
Music	3.1%	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%
Other fine arts	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%
Health sciences				
Dentistry	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%
Medicine	2.2%	1.9%	0.3%	1.9%
Nursing	3.8%	3.5%	3.8%	3.3%
Other health fields	2.8%	2.8%	1.6%	1.5%
Humanities				
English language and literature	9.4%	9.5%	10.6%	6.6%
Foreign languages and literature				
French	0.8%	0.8%	1.3%	0.7%
German	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	0.4%
Spanish	0.9%	0.8%	1.4%	0.7%
Other foreign language	0.7%	0.6%	0.9%	0.7%
History	2.8%	2.7%	5.1%	2.6%
Philosophy	1.8%	1.8%	2.6%	1.3%
Religion and theology	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%
General, other humanities	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%
Physical sciences				
Chemistry	3.1%	2.8%	5.5%	2.8%
Earth sciences (incl. geology)	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%
Physics	2.4%	2.2%	4.0%	2.6%
General, other physical sciences	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
Social sciences				
Anthropology and archeology	1.0%	1.0%	0.8%	0.9%
Economics	2.4%	2.4%	3.9%	2.5%
Political science, government	2.7%	2.8%	2.6%	1.9%
Sociology	2.4%	2.2%	1.6%	2.4%
General, other social sciences	1.1%	1.0%	1.4%	0.9%
Miscellaneous				
Agriculture, forestry	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	1.8%
Architecture, design	1.1%	1.0%	0.8%	0.7%
Business, commerce, and management	4.1%	4.2%	4.0%	2.7%
Geography	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%
Home economics	1.0%	1.0%	1.2%	1.1%
Industrial arts	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
Journalism	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%
Law	1.8%	1.8%	1.1%	0.9%
Library sciences	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%
Mathematics and statistics	3.0%	2.9%	3.4%	3.0%
Physical and health education	1.8%	1.8%	1.7%	1.3%
Psychology	3.9%	3.8%	4.3%	3.0%
Social work, social welfare	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Vocational-technical	1.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%
All other fields	4.7%	4.8%	2.9%	2.7%
None	5.0%	6.0%	1.2%	16.6%

FACT-FILE—Continued

Characteristics of College and University Faculty Members

Spouse's occupation—Continued	
Business executive, manager	4.2%
Other administrative job	3.9%
Technical, semi-professional	4.2%
Owner, small business	2.5%
Other white-collar job (clerical, sales)	4.6%
Skilled wage worker	1.9%
Semi-skilled or unskilled wage worker, farm laborer	0.4%
Armed forces	0.1%
Homemaker	14.0%
Father's occupation:	
College or university teaching, research, administration	4.7%
Schoolteaching, administration	4.4%
Other professional job	14.2%
Owner, large business	1.7%
Business executive, manager	10.6%
Other executive or administrative job	4.5%
Technical, semi-professional	5.4%
Owner, small business	18.3%
Other white-collar job (clerical, sales)	7.8%
Skilled wage worker	15.3%
Semi-skilled or unskilled wage worker, farm laborer	11.1%
Armed forces	1.9%
Homemaker	0.3%
Mother's occupation:	
College or university teaching, research, administration	1.5%
Schoolteaching, administration	11.3%
Other professional job	4.9%
Owner, large business	0.1%
Business executive, manager	0.7%
Other administrative job	1.7%
Technical, semi-professional	2.3%
Owner, small business	3.2%
Other white-collar job (clerical, sales)	8.5%
Skilled wage worker	3.9%
Semi-skilled or unskilled wage worker, farm laborer	5.1%
Armed forces	—
Homemaker	56.7%
Spouse's education:	
Eighth grade or less	0.2%
Some high school	0.5%
Completed high school	4.8%
Some college	12.8%
College graduate	18.6%
Attended graduate or professional school	11.2%
Attained advanced degree(s)	31.9%
Father's education:	
Eighth grade or less	22.9%
Some high school	12.8%
Completed high school	22.4%
Some college	17.4%
College graduate	4.0%
Attended graduate or professional school	5.8%
Attained advanced degree(s)	14.7%
Mother's education:	
Eighth grade or less	19.2%
Some high school	12.2%
Completed high school	31.3%
Some college	17.1%
College graduate	14.1%
Attended graduate or professional school	4.0%
Attained advanced degree(s)	6.0%

— indicates less than 0.1%

Faculty Attitudes on Social and Educational Issues

Attitudes	All institutions, by sex			All public institutions	All private institutions	4-year institutions				2-year institutions	All institutions, by enrollment			
	Men	Women	Total			Research universities	Other doctoral institutions	Comprehensive institutions	Liberal arts colleges		Under 5,000	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000 and over
Political views:														
Left	5.8%	5.9%	5.8%	5.6%	6.2%	6.3%	5.8%	6.5%	6.7%	3.9%	5.8%	5.4%	5.9%	5.7%
Liberal	33.1%	37.0%	33.8%	33.4%	35.8%	37.3%	33.0%	35.5%	35.8%	27.8%	33.1%	31.0%	32.2%	37.2%
Middle of the road	26.1%	26.8%	26.6%	26.1%	29.3%	25.9%	27.1%	26.0%	29.3%	27.0%	29.8%	29.3%	25.4%	24.9%
Moderately conservative	29.9%	28.4%	29.6%	30.7%	24.5%	26.6%	29.9%	27.8%	23.9%	36.7%	26.9%	30.2%	32.6%	27.7%
Strongly conservative	4.1%	2.0%	4.2%	4.3%	4.0%	4.0%	4.2%	4.1%	4.3%	4.6%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%	4.4%
Interest in teaching and research:														
Very heavy interest in teaching	38.6%	48.4%	40.1%	39.7%	42.3%	14.7%	24.4%	40.4%	52.2%	69.3%	56.4%	43.0%	44.6%	29.6%
Very heavy interest in research	5.1%	3.2%	5.0%	5.9%	6.2%	15.6%	7.4%	2.9%	1.9%	0.9%	1.7%	6.0%	3.7%	10.4%
Both, but leaning toward teaching	41.0%	40.1%	39.7%	29.6%	30.3%	32.7%	38.4%	34.4%	32.6%	23.1%	29.6%	30.4%	30.4%	28.7%
Both, but leaning toward research	15.3%	8.3%	14.2%	24.9%	21.2%	44.9%	29.8%	22.7%	13.2%	6.7%	12.3%	20.4%	21.4%	31.3%
Agree strongly or with reservations that:														
Despite differences among institutions, academics share intellectual, professional values	66.1%	66.1%	66.4%	66.3%	67.2%	69.4%	68.0%	65.2%	67.3%	66.5%	67.6%	66.8%	64.6%	67.6%
I remain enthusiastic about my work after a long day	58.2%	61.4%	59.0%	58.6%	61.4%	54.8%	56.4%	58.2%	63.9%	61.2%	54.9%	54.9%	59.9%	60.6%
I feel optimistic about my students' future	73.9%	73.2%	73.7%	72.9%	75.1%	74.1%	72.3%	71.2%	70.6%	74.0%	74.4%	72.4%	72.4%	74.0%
Other than not entering another profession, I have little or no regret about my choice of academic work	21.4%	20.1%	21.1%	20.1%	23.1%	16.0%	20.9%	21.7%	24.3%	25.0%	23.9%	25.3%	21.4%	15.2%
Students now seem more interested in learning														
than when I started teaching	24.6%	28.6%	25.5%	25.8%	24.9%	20.6%	24.9%	22.4%	24.7%	36.7%	24.7%	24.0%	24.3%	24.9%
I usually seem to accurately what I do in class	84.3%	84.2%	84.3%	84.2%	84.7%	84.4%	81.5%	79.4%	81.5%	82.9%	81.1%	79.4%	82.1%	83.3%
If I had it to do over, I would not become a college teacher	19.5%	19.2%	21.1%	21.4%	20.4%	16.8%	22.9%	23.7%	20.8%	14.7%	21.8%	24.2%	23.4%	17.4%
I am considering leaving my field of work to pursue														
a career outside academe within five years	9.1%	9.4%	9.2%	8.5%	12.1%	13.1%	9.2%	9.8%	9.4%	8.6%	7.5%	9.9%	9.8%	9.1%
I think it is a good time for any young person to enter														
an academic career	39.5%	39.5%	39.5%	45.2%	31.3%	36.1%	30.7%	34.9%	44.5%	45.1%	39.4%	34.4%	36.3%	47.7%
Some faculty members have too little say in university														
management	34.2%	30.0%	33.9%	36.9%	24.4%	30.0%	28.6%	29.3%	16.8%	23.2%	23.0%	23.7%	27.2%	28.8%
A small group of senior professors at my institution														
has disproportionate power in decision making	31.8%	36.2%	33.2%	33.6%	32.7%	46.0%	36.8%	31.8%	29.1%	23.2%	30.1%	32.5%	31.7%	36.7%
Teaching effectiveness, not publication, should be														
the primary criterion for faculty promotion	66.4%	73.8%	68.2%	64.2%	70.2%	53.6%	55.9%	71.9%	83.3%	88.0%	84.6%	72.1%	69.5%	47.3%
Merit should be the basis for salary differentiation														
for tenured faculty rank at a given institution	15.9%	16.0%	15.7%	22.1%	10.6%	10.3%	12.6%	21.6%	25.1%	36.8%	27.9%	22.0%	22.9%	16.9%
Faculty members should be free to present in class any idea														
that they consider relevant	84.0%	87.4%	84.2%	83.0%	85.4%	82.0%	82.8%	86.6%	86.8%	84.4%	86.7%	83.8%	83.5%	83.8%
Members of my department have fundamental differences														
about the discipline	53.9%	47.7%	52.7%	51.9%	44.7%	54.0%	53.3%	52.2%	43.9%	46.3%	42.9%	47.7%	52.2%	54.6%
Abolition of tenure would improve higher education	32.1%	43.2%	35.7%	34.5%	41.0%	24.2%	36.5%	35.1%	42.4%	35.4%	39.0%	33.1%	35.3%	35.6%
The administration at my institution														
strongly supports academic freedom	77.0%	75.4%	76.9%	76.1%	80.4%	80.7%	75.4%	74.5%	81.9%	75.4%	79.6%	74.4%	77.0%	78.5%
Collective bargaining by faculty members has no place														
in a college or university	39.9%	39.1%	39.4%	35.8%	49.1%	48.6%	42.5%	31.6%	34.8%	28.1%	32.4%	31.7%	33.8%	43.2%
Collective bargaining is likely to bring higher salaries														
and improved benefits	61.1%	65.0%	62.2%	61.8%	63.9%	54.2%	59.6%	65.3%	66.2%	66.2%	66.1%	68.3%	64.4%	55.0%
Faculty members should be more militant														
in defending their interests	58.7%	55.2%	57.7%	58.2%	55.3%	54.7%	55.9%	61.2%	55.3%	57.7%	55.1%	57.8%	59.7%	57.0%
There are circumstances where a faculty strike is legitimate	52.0%	51.2%	51.8%	51.8%	51.5%	43.3%	49.7%	56.5%	52.6%	54.6%	51.3%	57.1%	53.1%	48.2%
Normal academic requirements should be relaxed														
in appointment of minority group faculty members	11.8%	12.6%	11.9%	11.4%	14.0%	13.8%	12.2%	13.8%	15.8%	6.2%	14.0%	11.8%	9.7%	13.2%
Affirmative action is causing serious strains														
in my department	15.6%	14.9%	16.2%	17.1%	11.9%	15.0%	17.9%	18.8%	9.7%	15.3%	11.7%	17.3%	18.4%	15.9%
Affirmative action is unfair to white males	51.5%	24.1%	44.1%	45.5%	37.3%	40.2%	41.3%	44.2%	36.6%	51.7%	39.2%	44.1%	46.8%	43.9%
There are more part-time and adjunct faculty members														
at my institution today than there were five years ago	63.4%	68.5%	64.7%	65.8%	59.5%	51.6%	58.7%	65.6%	61.9%	79.8%	65.0%	64.0%	67.5%	62.2%
Part-time and adjunct faculty members fill jobs														
at my institution that would otherwise be filled														
by regular faculty members	51.7%	55.8%	52.8%	54.5%	54.8%	35.6%	47.5%	55.0%	55.2%	71.4%	50.8%	53.7%	58.9%	47.2%
One should insulate academic work from personal values	33.6%	27.3%	32.2%	33.0%	28.1%	29.4%	33.6%	33.0%	25.5%	35.4%	28.8%	35.0%	32.4%	32.5%
Scientists should publish findings regardless														
of the possible consequences	72.1%	62.6%	69.5%	70.1%	66.5%	71.5%	72.8%	67.8%	62.7%	70.3%	65.2%	70.0%	68.4%	72.5%
In my subject, a person's teaching and research														
inevitably reflect his or her political values	28.0%	27.9%	27.9%	26.7%	33.2%	22.3%	28.4%	29.7%	33.7%	29.0%	32.2%	29.5%	28.5%	24.3%
Big-contract research is more a source of money and prestige														
than an effective way of advancing knowledge	66.4%	67.8%	66.8%	66.8%	66.3%	57.9%	73.5%	68.7%	72.0%	68.3%	70.2%	64.6%	68.6%	64.2%
I prefer teaching courses in limited specialties	42.9%	49.1%	44.8%	45.2%	43.1%	47.2%	49.3%	43.5%	39.4%	43.7%	43.4%	43.4%	44.5%	46.5%
My department unduly stresses research at the cost														
of preparing college teachers	16.0%	16.5%	16.0%	16.8%	12.2%	27.5%	28.9%	13.4%	8.1%	4.1%	7.1%	13.1%	15.0%	22.9%

Agree strongly or with reservations that:	All institutions, by sex			All public institutions	All private institutions	4-year institutions				2-year institutions	All institutions, by enrollment			
	Men	Women	Total			Research universities	Other doctoral institutions	Comprehensive institutions	Liberal arts colleges		Under 5,000	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000 and over
In teaching undergraduates, I prefer those who are clear about career goals	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	45.5%	48.4%	42.2%	49.2%	44.5%	58.7%	50.1%	47.2%	45.6%	48.8%	44.9%
Exciting developments are taking place in my field	84.9%	86.6%	85.7%	85.7%	83.0%	88.6%	85.0%	84.6%	88.8%	84.6%	82.9%	84.6%	85.6%	86.3%
My field is too research oriented	14.4%	13.1%	13.7%	14.6%	12.9%	17.9%	17.4%	16.4%	11.6%	16.2%	15.5%	16.2%	13.3%	13.3%
I consider myself an intellectual	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%	79.7%	78.7%	80.6%	78.9%	78.2%	78.6%	76.5%	79.5%	79.3%	78.2%	79.2%
New developments in my field are not very interesting to me	12.6%	11.6%	12.2%	11.9%	13.1%	8.6%	11.0%	12.4%	13.6%	13.4%	11.7%	12.2%	13.0%	9.5%
My job is the source of considerable personal strain	37.9%	43.2%	40.3%	40.2%	40.7%	43.6%	47.3%	41.4%	34.9%	39.7%	38.3%	37.4%	39.7%
I tend to subordinate an aspect of my life to my work	36.9%	40.0%	38.3%	38.7%	38.0%	41.1%	40.2%	34.9%	36.8%	32.5%	36.8%	35.6%	37.8%
I hardly ever get time to give a piece of work the attention it deserves	44.9%	41.6%	43.5%	43.0%	44.7%	47.0%	45.3%	46.3%	48.6%	39.8%	43.8%	43.7%	45.4%	41.3%
I enjoy informal interaction with students outside class	90.8%	90.4%	90.6%	90.9%	90.1%	90.0%	90.2%	90.7%	89.7%	89.2%	91.3%	89.3%	90.9%	89.1%
I frequently invite students to my home	31.3%	30.8%	31.1%	30.7%	32.0%	31.5%	30.9%	28.5%	41.0%	21.1%	33.7%	30.8%	29.6%	27.0%
Most students expect too much attention	19.9%	17.0%	18.6%	18.7%	18.4%	19.9%	18.1%	19.8%	20.8%	14.9%	19.4%	19.4%	17.9%	18.9%
Students should seek out faculty members only during posted office hours	24.1%	25.6%	24.8%	24.8%	24.9%	23.4%	23.5%	23.8%	27.7%	27.3%	23.7%	23.6%	24.9%	25.1%
Teaching would be easier at my institution if students were better prepared before admission	61.9%	58.1%	60.2%	59.6%	61.2%	63.9%	64.3%	66.8%	53.8%	59.2%	59.8%	63.1%	63.1%	61.4%
My institution spends too much time and money teaching what students should have learned in high school	49.5%	49.0%	49.3%	49.4%	49.2%	48.4%	49.2%	48.3%	54.2%	49.0%	49.6%	49.4%	49.2%	49.8%
Abolition of grades would increase undergraduate education	10.8%	10.0%	10.4%	10.6%	9.9%	11.9%	11.4%	11.6%	10.9%	8.1%	9.7%	11.0%	9.9%	9.8%
Less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education would improve undergraduate education	54.2%	54.9%	54.5%	54.1%	55.2%	57.1%	54.1%	53.1%	54.8%	53.1%	52.9%	53.1%	53.1%	54.6%
Faculty specialization has hurt the undergraduate curriculum	43.3%	42.9%	43.1%	43.1%	43.3%	45.9%	43.8%	43.7%	39.6%	38.3%	43.8%	39.1%	39.4%	42.1%
Graduate education in my field is given a good deal of emphasis	75.0%	75.4%	75.2%	74.9%	75.7%	81.2%	79.2%	77.9%	71.8%	70.2%	77.8%	77.0%	74.8%	76.6%
It's very hard to get tenure in my department without publishing	42.8%	42.2%	42.5%	42.9%	41.9%	49.1%	44.9%	44.2%	40.0%	38.6%	43.1%	43.1%	43.1%	44.4%
It's harder to get tenure in my department than it was five years ago	68.1%	68.6%	68.3%	68.1%	68.7%	68.2%	66.0%	70.1%	66.3%	67.2%	67.8%	68.0%	68.6%	71.0%
It has become much harder to get research support in my field in the last two or three years	69.4%	68.0%	68.8%	68.8%	68.9%	74.9%	68.4%	72.2%	63.8%	68.1%	69.8%	66.7%	70.3%	71.8%
Undergraduates at my institution are not getting as good an education as they were five years ago	21.9%	24.8%	23.2%	24.2%	21.7%	20.8%	21.4%	19.4%	24.6%	27.8%	23.5%	24.7%	22.6%	25.3%
On the whole, faculty salaries at my institution have kept up with inflation	31.6%	31.8%	31.7%	31.7%	31.7%	31.1%	31.0%	28.9%	30.8%	33.1%	28.9%	29.9%	29.3%	33.6%
My institution has serious financial problems	42.9%	44.1%	43.4%	43.9%	42.7%	48.7%	49.0%	51.8%	44.3%	39.4%	42.4%	43.8%	48.7%	44.3%
Some tenured faculty members at my institution will lose their jobs in the next five years for a lack of funds	19.6%	19.8%	19.7%	19.7%	19.8%	19.4%	17.0%	19.8%	19.8%	23.1%	21.9%	17.9%	17.9%	22.1%
My department has made significant changes in graduate courses because of a tighter job market	38.1%	38.4%	38.2%	38.6%	37.6%	35.9%	34.6%	38.4%	41.1%	34.6%	37.1%	42.0%	40.4%	38.5%
A scholar's goal is to advance knowledge without regard for the implications for society	53.1%	54.0%	53.5%	53.8%	53.0%	49.3%	54.0%	50.8%	60.7%	48.5%	48.1%	48.7%	53.6%	55.6%
Government research funds should be allocated to universities on the basis of the need to solve significant social problems	59.2%	59.2%	59.2%	59.1%	59.4%	70.1%	68.1%	69.0%	61.0%	46.9%	64.1%	60.8%	59.5%	57.9%
Sponsored research for a private company is not a proper university activity	29.6%	29.6%	29.6%	29.6%	29.6%	32.6%	29.8%	33.0%	29.0%	29.1%	25.9%	29.4%	32.3%	29.4%
Universities have a responsibility to contribute to the economic development of their communities	83.0%	80.2%	81.7%	81.2%	82.5%	90.0%	87.1%	86.8%	80.1%	80.0%	84.1%	79.5%	79.7%	77.3%
Scientific progress these days is more of a threat than a positive contribution to human welfare	11.0%	10.1%	10.6%	10.6%	10.8%	9.3%	13.9%	14.3%	10.1%	12.5%	11.7%	13.2%	13.3%	12.2%
I'm very apprehensive about the country's future	51.4%	49.1%	50.3%	50.1%	50.7%	46.3%	48.0%	50.6%	49.6%	55.1%	51.9%	48.6%	49.6%	52.4%
Academic research on the genetic basis of difference in intelligence should be encouraged	26.3%	23.1%	24.8%	24.6%	25.3%	24.6%	25.0%	23.1%	24.6%	30.5%	28.2%	26.4%	26.4%	25.1%
Affirmative action has increased the number of women on my institution's faculty	74.0%	74.8%	74.4%	74.6%	74.3%	74.9%	72.4%	75.1%	73.6%	71.3%	70.7%	77.3%	74.7%	74.9%
Affirmative action has increased the number of minority-group members on my institution's faculty	58.9%	61.1%	59.9%	59.4%	60.9%	68.5%	67.9%	68.4%	61.9%	48.3%	63.9%	60.4%	58.7%	60.0%
I am satisfied with the results of affirmative action at my institution	59.0%	58.8%	58.9%	59.1%	57.5%	63.9%	58.0%	60.8%	55.8%	61.5%	58.4%	61.4%	58.7%	56.9%
My institution is as interested now as it was five years ago in increasing the numbers of women and minority-group members on the faculty	75.7%	76.2%	75.9%	76.1%	75.5%	73.9%	75.1%	73.7%	79.7%	77.2%	76.9%	76.0%	73.1%	73.1%
Goals considered very important or fairly important for undergraduates														
Appreciation of literature and the arts	88.4%	89.6%	89.0%	89.0%	88.8%	84.5%	90.1%	91.2%	92.2%	87.9%	91.8%	87.0%	89.5%	89.5%
Firm moral values	82.4%	83.1%	82.7%	82.7%	82.7%	79.2%	79.2%	82.7%	89.4%	84.9%	86.7%	83.1%	80.9%	77.8%
Enhanced creative capacities	90.4%	91.1%	90.7%	91.0%	90.0%	91.2%	89.7%	90.1%	93.1%	89.6%	90.8%	89.4%	89.3%	91.1%
Competence in mathematics	90.3%	90.1%	90.2%	89.8%	90.8%	89.9%	89.9%	91.9%	89.2%	92.7%	90.4%	93.0%	91.5%	91.0%
Preparation for a career	73.7%	73.8%	73.8%	73.8%	73.8%	73.7%	79.8%	77.2%	73.7%	85.8%	79.1%	77.3%	80.2%	77.1%
Tolerance of diversity	94.0%	94.6%	94.3%	94.2%	94.5%	93.2%	94.1%	95.2%	96.1%	91.4%	94.6%	93.1%	93.1%	94.3%
Self knowledge	93.2%	93.6%	93.4%	93.4%	93.4%	92.1%	93.4%	94.2%	94.6%	90.5%	93.2%	92.3%	93.9%	90.7%
Knowledge of one's values and beliefs	94.0%	94.6%	94.3%	94.3%	94.3%	91.1%	91.8%	94.1%	93.9%	78.4%	93.1%	93.2%	91.7%	94.4%
Aspects of higher education that are very important or fairly important personally														
Own discipline	96.1%	96.1%	96.1%	96.0%	96.4%	97.1%	96.1%	96.2%	96.1%	93.1%	96.1%	96.9%	97.6%	93.0%
Own department	84.3%	84.7%	84.5%	84.4%	84.7%	86.5%	90.1%	92.9%	81.6%	81.4%	83.1%	85.3%	85.6%	83.1%
Own institution	74.0%	74.6%	74.3%	74.3%	74.3%	74.0%	70.1%	70.4%	69.5%	81.5%	74.5%	73.4%	74.9%	75.4%
Relationship with students	96.4%	96.6%	96.5%	96.4%	96.6%	96.4%	96.4%	96.8%	97.8%	96.5%	96.8%	95.3%	96.9%	94.7%
National or international professional activity	61.7%	61.8%	61.7%	61.7%	61.7%	61.5%	66.3%	64.0%	61.5%	47.7%	59.2%	56.3%	56.0%	65.7%
General feeling about own institution														
Very good place for me	42.0%	42.6%	42.3%	42.8%	41.6%	44.9%	43.6%	39.4%	47.1%	40.8%	46.3%	39.6%	39.4%	42.3%
Fairly good for me	49.1%	49.1%	49.1%	48.8%	49.5%	47.4%	46.7%	51.0%	44.7%	44.9%	45.3%	52.0%	49.4%	49.1%
Not the place for me	8.9%	8.3%	8.6%	8.4%	8.9%	7.7%	9.6%	9.6%	8.2%	14.3%	8.4%	8.5%	11.0%	8.3%
Views about the institution's undergraduate program														
Composition of the curriculum:														
General education requirements														
Too little	24.1%	24.8%	24.4%	24.6%	24.0%	20.6%	25.4%	21.4%	21.8%	31.0%	19.8%	21.0%	25.2%	26.2%
About right	68.4%	68.7%	68.5%	68.3%	68.9%	78.3%	68.9%	69.7%	69.1%	61.9%	71.6%	69.2%	66.2%	65.0%
Too much	7.5%	6.5%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	1.1%	5.6%	8.9%	9.1%	7.1%	8.6%	9.8%	8.6%	9.0%
Requirements for a major														
Too little	14.4%	14.4%	14.4%	14.5%	14.0%	10.1%	15.7%	15.6%	13.6%	17.2%	15.4%	13.4%	14.4%	14.9%
About right	77.1%	77.8%	77.4%	77.4%	77.3%	86.4%	77.1%	76.0%	79.2%	73.5%	76.3%	76.7%	79.0%	76.5%
Too much	8.5%	7.8%	8.2%	8.1%	8.6%	3.4%	7.1%	8.4%	7.2%	9.3%	8.3%	9.9%	6.6%	8.6%
Requirements for preprofessional programs														
Too little	13.8%	14.3%	14.0%	13.9%	14.7%	10.3%	13.6%	12.8%	11.0%	17.5%	12.0%	12.3%	14.3%	13.7%
About right	75.2%	75.7%	75.5%	75.8%	75.0%	77.4%	72.0%	73.1%	77.5%	78.1%	78.3%	74.1%	75.4%	74.9%
Too much	11.0%	10.1%	10.6%	10.4%	11.0%	12.3%	14.4%	14.1%	11.5%	4.2%	9.7%	13.7%	10.3%	11.4%
Electives in the major														
Too little	33.0%	33.4%	33.2%	33.4%	27.8%	21.2%	31.3%	29.4%	29.8%	28.2%	28.6%	27.0%	29.6%	25.0%
About right	66.9%	62.6%	65.5%	67.5%	67.6%	72.7%	65.9%	64.8%	66.6%	67.4%	67.0%	66.7%	66.3%	69.5%
Too much	5.4%	4.0%	5.0%	5.1%	4.6%	6.1%	2.8%	5.8%	3.6%	4.3%	4.5%	6.4%	4.1%	5.5%
Electives outside the major														
Too little	26.2%	34.8%	29.3%	29.2%	24.0%	27.2%	32.2%	29.7%	22.7%	27.2%	24.5%	28.1%	29.1%	29.6%

Continued on Following Page

FACT-FILE—Continued

Attitudes

Views of the undergraduate program—continued	All institutions, by sex			4-year institutions					2-year institutions	All institutions, by enrollment			
	Men	Women	Total	All public institutions	All private institutions	Research universities	Other doctoral institutions	Comprehensive institutions	Liberal arts colleges		Under 5,000	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000 and over
Electives outside the major—Continued														
About right	63.1%	57.3%	60.1%	62.9%	59.7%	66.6%	59.7%	63.1%	70.5%	63.1%	67.1%	64.6%	61.8%	62.4%
Too much	8.1%	10.0%	9.0%	7.9%	9.3%	6.2%	8.1%	7.2%	6.8%	8.7%	8.3%	7.3%	7.1%	7.9%
Requirements within the major should be cut back														
A great deal	9.1%	10.7%	9.9%	9.8%	11.6%	10.1%	12.4%	9.4%	9.8%	10.7%	10.7%	11.7%	9.4%	9.2%
Some	29.1%	30.1%	29.6%	29.6%	29.5%	30.1%	31.4%	29.4%	26.8%	29.7%	29.3%	31.9%	30.5%	27.8%
Should be increased	9.9%	10.3%	10.1%	9.0%	12.1%	8.5%	11.1%	9.7%	7.4%	10.4%	9.9%	10.4%	10.1%	10.7%
No opinion/ unsure	3.4%	3.6%	3.5%	2.9%	3.1%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%	4.0%	3.2%	3.2%	2.4%	3.1%	2.8%
Other views about the institution														
Following should be rated good to excellent/ Poor opinions														
Preparing students with diverse interests	20.2%	19.8%	19.9%	20.9%	17.9%	11.8%	13.2%	21.4%	23.8%	20.7%	14.8%	20.3%	20.8%	20.6%
Preparing students for a vocation	9.6%	8.2%	8.9%	9.2%	12.1%	9.1%	9.1%	10.8%	19.3%	9.1%	14.4%	8.6%	8.7%	8.9%
Providing courses for exploring personal interests	21.7%	23.1%	22.4%	21.5%	26.9%	32.8%	24.2%	16.6%	14.9%	23.2%	26.6%	21.7%	23.2%	22.1%
Preparing citizens	24.8%	25.8%	25.0%	25.2%	21.8%	29.9%	26.6%	25.5%	19.8%	24.4%	24.6%	29.7%	21.9%	26.2%
Teaching values	30.6%	30.8%	30.6%	43.3%	19.0%	28.9%	11.0%	32.4%	16.2%	34.9%	21.4%	33.0%	32.2%	32.7%
Present academic standards should be somewhat or much higher for														
College-bound students	62.1%	64.2%	62.8%	66.0%	61.1%	53.0%	64.6%	69.6%	65.8%	58.6%	64.5%	61.3%	65.1%	59.7%
Bachelor's degrees	46.7%	48.0%	47.2%	52.6%	38.3%	46.4%	39.0%	62.7%	57.4%	24.1%	53.6%	53.9%	52.4%	50.3%
Graduate admissions	41.1%	44.1%	42.9%	44.0%	37.5%	24.9%	51.2%	52.7%	31.2%	8.5%	32.7%	44.1%	46.0%	43.2%
Advanced degrees	41.6%	46.1%	43.5%	45.1%	35.6%	47.5%	54.3%	41.8%	29.2%	10.0%	31.5%	43.9%	45.7%	45.7%
The following should be cited factors (net)														
Own salary	54.7%	64.8%	60.7%	61.3%	57.6%	55.6%	61.7%	66.6%	58.5%	58.0%	59.7%	64.0%	61.7%	56.6%
Own department's reputation outside the institution	35.6%	31.7%	33.1%	35.3%	34.1%	28.6%	42.1%	41.3%	44.3%	30.0%	32.7%	34.6%	39.7%	31.9%
Intellectual environment	54.4%	52.7%	53.9%	55.6%	48.2%	36.3%	56.1%	60.4%	50.1%	63.0%	53.1%	56.7%	59.2%	47.3%
Faculty salary levels	63.5%	72.0%	66.8%	69.7%	64.7%	64.5%	68.1%	75.2%	65.9%	60.9%	67.7%	71.5%	73.0%	64.0%
Teaching load	63.7%	64.9%	64.2%	61.9%	68.1%	46.6%	64.6%	68.5%	62.6%	61.6%	62.8%	66.5%	66.5%	62.3%
Ratio of teaching faculty to students	54.4%	54.3%	53.3%	56.2%	50.1%	54.1%	59.4%	57.7%	23.9%	53.2%	33.7%	51.4%	58.0%	59.8%
The administration	66.4%	64.6%	65.4%	67.1%	62.3%	62.0%	67.6%	72.2%	62.0%	62.2%	57.9%	70.0%	70.2%	62.3%
My department's intellectual environment	42.7%	41.9%	42.2%	43.6%	36.0%	35.7%	45.9%	46.3%	35.4%	43.6%	37.0%	40.4%	45.6%	42.3%
Personal faculty relations in my department	33.5%	36.4%	34.4%	35.8%	28.0%	35.4%	41.3%	37.5%	26.4%	28.6%	26.0%	34.5%	38.3%	35.0%
Academic ability of my department's graduate students	48.3%	44.1%	47.2%	48.5%	39.5%	35.1%	51.4%	55.1%	43.8%	51.9%	43.3%	50.7%	51.1%	43.4%
Academic ability of my department's undergraduates	60.2%	56.1%	59.2%	62.6%	43.9%	45.1%	59.2%	68.2%	68.1%	75.3%	53.5%	57.7%	62.4%	59.4%
My institution has responded to declining enrollments and/or financing by taking these measures														
Cut academic programs	63.7%	65.6%	64.4%	65.5%	58.4%	61.6%	64.0%	66.8%	51.6%	67.2%	59.0%	69.3%	64.9%	64.1%
Left staff vacancies open	76.3%	74.3%	75.6%	77.9%	67.9%	76.1%	75.2%	76.8%	62.7%	77.4%	66.8%	79.3%	77.6%	75.9%
Restricted enrollment	26.2%	20.6%	24.5%	26.8%	11.9%	53.5%	25.9%	27.4%	10.6%	14.9%	9.4%	20.3%	23.9%	34.6%
Laid off some nontenured faculty members	40.9%	44.1%	41.6%	42.1%	38.5%	31.7%	37.7%	52.4%	37.8%	38.8%	40.2%	54.2%	42.2%	34.8%
Laid off some tenured faculty members	10.6%	11.0%	10.8%	10.5%	12.4%	4.3%	9.1%	14.8%	13.6%	11.5%	12.7%	19.1%	10.4%	6.0%
Frozen or reduced academic salaries	36.7%	40.9%	37.6%	36.8%	30.7%	44.8%	34.7%	34.0%	32.1%	38.3%	35.9%	30.7%	38.2%	41.1%
Asked some faculty members to retire early	41.4%	39.8%	40.7%	40.3%	42.8%	31.0%	44.8%	46.8%	40.3%	39.7%	37.7%	45.3%	42.2%	38.2%
I have a great deal or quite a bit of opportunity to influence policies of														
My department	55.6%	57.6%	56.9%	57.9%	69.0%	53.5%	56.9%	59.6%	76.1%	62.6%	70.7%	62.2%	59.6%	53.2%
My institution	11.2%	13.4%	12.3%	11.9%	20.3%	9.3%	10.1%	12.1%	25.3%	16.7%	22.9%	11.3%	12.2%	10.4%
Administrators are somewhat or very authoritarian in														
My department	28.8%	31.6%	30.3%	31.1%	23.8%	31.7%	31.4%	28.6%	18.6%	28.5%	22.8%	26.8%	29.5%	36.8%
My institution	66.6%	66.9%	66.7%	68.3%	58.9%	66.3%	68.0%	61.7%	49.3%	65.4%	57.1%	70.1%	68.2%	68.5%
Other views														
My work situation today is much better or somewhat better than it was five years ago in terms of														
Teaching load														
Somewhat or much better	17.8%	22.9%	19.4%	18.9%	22.0%	21.9%	26.1%	19.0%	17.6%	14.9%	19.0%	17.2%	18.3%	21.9%
About the same	62.0%	55.6%	61.0%	61.0%	60.8%	62.7%	54.5%	61.1%	60.2%	62.5%	60.4%	62.3%	61.2%	60.5%
Somewhat or much worse	19.2%	21.5%	19.6%	20.0%	17.3%	15.3%	19.3%	19.9%	22.0%	22.5%	20.7%	20.6%	20.6%	17.6%
Department morale														
Somewhat or much better	23.7%	27.6%	24.6%	23.7%	29.1%	26.5%	26.3%	23.3%	29.3%	22.1%	26.0%	21.8%	22.5%	26.2%
About the same	37.3%	28.7%	35.5%	35.0%	37.8%	35.5%	31.2%	34.6%	37.5%	38.0%	37.6%	35.8%	35.1%	34.6%
Somewhat or much worse	38.9%	43.7%	39.9%	41.3%	33.1%	38.1%	42.4%	42.2%	33.3%	39.8%	36.4%	42.3%	42.4%	39.2%
Students' job prospects														
Somewhat or much better	23.7%	21.9%	23.5%	23.6%	22.8%	22.5%	23.6%	23.0%	20.6%	25.8%	21.6%	22.9%	25.2%	22.9%
About the same	40.4%	33.8%	38.6%	38.1%	41.2%	40.4%	39.4%	38.5%	42.4%	35.8%	40.8%	40.4%	37.3%	38.0%
Somewhat or much worse	35.9%	44.3%	37.9%	38.4%	36.0%	37.1%	37.0%	38.6%	37.0%	38.6%	37.4%	36.8%	37.5%	39.1%
The library														
Somewhat or much better	36.4%	42.7%	40.0%	39.2%	44.0%	36.6%	41.5%	37.8%	47.4%	42.7%	45.9%	37.4%	39.4%	38.6%
About the same	37.8%	36.9%	36.4%	37.9%	40.4%	37.6%	35.2%	38.2%	36.8%	40.8%	39.9%	40.9%	36.2%	38.5%
Somewhat or much worse	25.8%	20.5%	23.7%	23.0%	15.7%	25.8%	23.4%	24.0%	13.8%	16.5%	14.1%	21.7%	24.4%	22.8%
Predicted importance of colleges and universities in 10 years														
As centers for research														
More	39.8%	45.4%	41.1%	42.4%	34.9%	43.2%	44.0%	39.3%	33.4%	42.7%	39.3%	37.8%	40.8%	44.0%
About the same	52.7%	46.5%	51.2%	50.1%	56.4%	48.8%	48.2%	52.1%	58.3%	51.5%	53.7%	53.7%	51.0%	48.9%
Less	7.5%	8.1%	7.7%	7.5%	8.7%	8.1%	7.8%	8.5%	8.3%	5.9%	6.9%	8.5%	8.2%	7.1%
As institutions for training professionals														
More	38.0%	43.0%	39.5%	41.0%	32.6%	36.0%	36.9%	39.2%	30.7%	47.6%	38.1%	37.6%	38.9%	41.7%
About the same	56.3%	50.2%	54.5%	53.0%	61.6%	59.1%	58.2%	55.3%	62.1%	44.9%	55.7%	57.1%	54.9%	52.3%
Less	5.7%	6.8%	6.0%	6.0%	5.9%	4.9%	4.9%	5.5%	7.2%	7.8%	6.2%	5.3%	6.2%	5.9%
As a source of general education														
More	27.3%	29.7%	27.9%	27.7%	28.7%	21.5%	23.8%	27.9%	31.4%	35.0%	33.4%	25.7%	27.1%	26.8%
About the same	61.3%	58.1%	60.5%	60.7%	59.7%	65.4%	63.0%	60.6%	57.3%	55.4%	57.2%	60.5%	61.0%	61.9%
Less	11.4%	12.2%	11.6%	11.6%	11.6%	13.0%	13.2%	11.5%	11.4%	9.6%	9.4%	13.8%	12.0%	11.4%
As a final remedy for deficiencies in pre-college education														
More	23.2%	23.9%	23.2%	23.2%	23.4%	15.9%	17.6%	19.6%	28.8%	36.3%	29.4%	21.2%	21.9%	22.2%
About the same	41.8%	36.3%	40.4%	39.5%	44.4%	40.4%	45.0%	41.9%	42.0%	39.4%	40.5%	41.8%	40.4%	39.5%
Less	35.1%	39.8%	36.4%	37.3%	32.2%	43.7%	37.4%	38.5%	29.2%	24.3%	30.1%	37.0%	37.6%	38.3%
As a source of moral values for the nation														
More	11.5%	11.5%	11.6%	11.0%	14.8%	8.6%	11.4%	10.1%	16.5%	15.2%	15.7%	11.1%	10.7%	10.7%
About the same	61.1%	57.5%	60.0%	59.5%	62.3%	63.1%	62.0%	61.2%	60.8%	53.9%	58.9%	59.5%	62.6%	58.0%
Less	27.4%	31.0%	28.4%	29.6%	22.9%	28.3%	26.6%	28.7%	22.7%	30.9%	25.4%	29.5%	26.7%	31.2%
As a source of new ideas														
More	37.3%	39.1%	38.1%	38.5%	35.9%	38.1%	39.8%	34.7%	34.4%	42.9%	40.9%	35.0%	36.3%	39.8%
About the same	55.4%	53.8%	54.7%	54.5%	56.1%	55.6%	53.3%	56.9%	57.8%	50.7%	51.8%	56.4%	57.1%	53.2%
Less	7.3%	7.0%	7.2%	7.0%	8.0%	6.3%	6.8%	8.4%	7.8%	6.4%	7.4%	8.6%	6.6%	7.0%

Note: Survey results are based on a two-stage stratified random sample of 5,000 faculty members at 310 two-year and non-specialized four-year colleges and universities in the spring of 1984. Sections may not add to 100 per cent because of weighting, rounding, multiple responses, or exclusion of "no response" or other miscellaneous categories. Results have not been adjusted for apparent inconsistencies in some responses.

SOURCE OF DATA: CARNEGIE SURVEY OF FACULTY. COPYRIGHT © 1985, THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING. REPRODUCED WITH PERMISSION OF THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING